

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

Subject: Iowa River – Clear Creek Section 206 Meeting Minutes

1. On 25 November 2002, the following individuals met to discuss the status of the subject project:

Karin Franklin, City of Iowa City
 Dan Holderness, City of Coralville
 Camie Knollenberg, Corps of Engineers
 Debi VanOpdorp, Corps of Engineers

Rick Fosse, City of Iowa City
 Larry Wilson, Univ .of Iowa (U of I)
 Amy Moore, Corps of Engineers
 Terry Trueblood, City of Iowa City

2. Follow up items or old business was covered first as indicated in the table below:

ITEM	RESPONSIBILITY	ACTION/STATUS
Provide sponsors with Construction and O&M Costs	Amy Moore	Costs were presented (attachment 1). A 20% contingency was used. We will continue to refine the costs.
Provide answer regarding commitment to O&M dollar amount	Camie Knollenberg	Signing the PCA does not commit the sponsor to an O&M amount, only to performing the tasks.
Provide sponsors with a copy of draft PCA	Camie Knollenberg	A separate meeting will be scheduled in January to facilitate discussion of the PCAs.
Provide Charlene with a 50-year plan for sites without project	Sponsors	City of Iowa City has already provided land use plan. Coralville and U of I will provide this info to Charlene by the end of Jan.
Develop geogrid design for Site F and provide to University	Amy Moore/ Dan Foltz	Part of the site is actually in Iowa City. The geogrid design is not needed at that location. Plans will be updated to reflect this. U of I would like to see cost comparison between geogrid and riprap.

Review seed mix used at IMU	Charlene Carmack	U of I has reviewed the seed mix. Comments were provided hard copy (attachment 2) at this meeting. Charlene will need to call Larry to discuss.
Coordinate Virtual Reality Tour	Camie Knollenberg	We hope to be able to have some portion of this complete by March 03.

3. New Business:

- a. Explanation of weed wicking (Moore): This is the process where weeds are sprayed by hand during the first years of construction to keep invasive species from taking over. It is labor intensive and requires personnel that have plant identification knowledge. The cost per acre is \$920. The current cost estimate contains \$1,828,960 for this task.
- b. Present options to accomplish (Moore): At the sites where herbicides cannot be used, mowing will be used. Charlene feels that weed wicking should be used as much as possible. A compromise was reached by requiring weed wicking along a buffer along the river on sites larger than 4 acres. On sites smaller than 4 acres, the entire site will be weed wicked. Additional options include supporting a Master's degree graduate student to accomplish this work. More research will be done to investigate the most cost effective method of invasive species control. When this method is finalized, the costs will be revised to reflect this.
- c. Site K – Decide on addition of private parcel (Dan Holderness/Corps): Dan provided a map to Amy showing this parcel. The size of the parcel will probably provide added benefits to make it worth the cost of the parcel. We will coordinate with Charlene on this.
- d. Site C Lower – Discuss costs versus habitat improvement (Knollenberg/Moore): The site is an acre and the construction cost is \$427,158. It may be difficult to justify restoration of this site. The benefits will be negated unless the concrete company stops the runoff from reaching the riverbank.
- e. Explanation of site prioritization (Knollenberg): The team would like a prioritization of sites from each sponsor.
- f. Discuss signing options
 - i. Timing (Knollenberg): The PCA can be signed after feasibility (65% design) or after P&S (100%). It is recommended that the sponsors wait until after P&S to sign.

- ii. One PCA versus three (Vanopdorp): It was decided that there should be 3 PCAs instead of one. Each sponsor will need to present the PCA to boards for approval. Having separate agreements will allow for facilitation of this.
- g. Explain how recreation features will change the PCA language (VanOpdorp): There will be specific mention of the recreation features in the PCA.
- h. Questions on PCA language (Sponsors): The sponsors will provide their attorneys' with copies of the PCA for review.
- i. Decide on plan of action (Sponsors): A separate meeting will be scheduled to talk about PCA questions. The sponsors will bring the attorneys to the meeting. Debi will coordinate this and ensure that the Corps attorney attends.
- j. Explanation of options (Knollenberg): There are several options for public involvement. These include websites, open houses, mailings, public meetings, and newspaper articles.
- k. Develop plan (Sponsors/Corps Team): The sponsors are interested in establishing a website after the plan is decided. They do not anticipate any public concern. The website will help reach consensus with the boards that will sign the PCAs.
- l. Habitat Evaluation Update (Knollenberg): Charlene is working on developing a Floristic Quality Index model that should reflect the changes in vegetation diversity. She will be setting up a meeting with DNR and FWS to access existing and future with project conditions. She hopes to conduct these meetings in January.
- m. Explanation of Continuing Resolution Period (Knollenberg): The Corps appropriation bill has not been signed. Continuing Resolution Acts have been passed to provide stopgap funding until the bill is signed. The current act is good through January 11, 2003. It may be March before the appropriations are received in the district.
- n. Purposed funding amount (Knollenberg): The proposed funding amount for this fiscal year is \$115, 000 to complete the feasibility report.
- o. Congressional information (Knollenberg): A line item mention was included in the house mark up of the appropriation bill for the project. The language stated that \$189,000 is needed to complete feasibility report and initiate plans and specs. This means helps with prioritization of funding.
- p. Nature Conservancy Burning Article (Knollenberg): An article was handed out that illustrates the burning concept as an operation and maintenance measure.

CEMVR-PM-M

04 December 2002

Subject: Iowa River – Clear Creek Section 206 Meeting Minutes

4. The following action items were identified:
 - a. Inquire about de-authorization of project after 50 years. (Knollenberg)
 - b. Inquire about contracting with graduate students as a research project for weed wicking. (Knollenberg)
 - c. Schedule a PCA meeting in January. (Van Opdorp)
 - d. Update Site F plate to reflect accurate real estate interest. (Moore)
 - e. Update costs to show new weed wicking plan and Site F changes. (Moore)
 - f. Call Larry Wilson regarding seed mixture at IMU.
 - g. Provide U of I with cost comparison of geogrid and riprap. (Moore)
 - h. Provide Charlene with 50-year plan for sites. (Coralville, U of I)
 - i. Provide PCA to attorneys. (All Sponsors)
 - j. Brainstorm for work in kind ideas. (All Sponsors)



CAMIE KNOLLENBERG
Study Manager

CF:

Iowa River Clear Creek Website

Attachment 1: Cost Estimate

DRAFT Cost Estimate Summary

25-Nov-02

Site	Feature	Construction		Average Annual O&M		Total O&M	
A	Forested Wetland	\$	437,555.00	\$	5,940.00	\$	297,000.00
	Wetland	\$	82,531.00	\$	1,540.00	\$	77,000.00
	Prairie Buffer	\$	151,952.00	\$	3,190.00	\$	159,500.00
	Subtotal	\$	672,038.00	\$	10,670.00	\$	533,500.00
C Upper	Forested Wetland	\$	74,588.00	\$	550.00	\$	27,500.00
	Non-Forested Wetland	\$	102,024.00	\$	220.00	\$	11,000.00
	Rock Structures	\$	203,955.00	\$	640.50	\$	32,025.00
	Subtotal	\$	380,567.00	\$	1,410.50	\$	70,525.00
C Lower	Construction	\$	427,158.00	\$	660.00	\$	33,000.00
	Subtotal	\$	427,158.00	\$	660.00	\$	33,000.00
D	Forested Wetland	\$	138,995.00	\$	2,310.00	\$	115,500.00
	Non-Forested Wetland	\$	167,779.00	\$	1,870.00	\$	93,500.00
	Subtotal	\$	306,774.00	\$	4,180.00	\$	209,000.00
E	Willow Wetland	\$	119,342.00	\$	550.00	\$	27,500.00
	Cattail Wetland	\$	85,978.00	\$	880.00	\$	44,000.00
	Wetland Buffer	\$	61,973.00	\$	550.00	\$	27,500.00
	Subtotal	\$	267,293.00	\$	1,980.00	\$	99,000.00
F	Vegetative Modification	\$	112,015.00	\$	770.00	\$	38,500.00
	North Shoreline	\$	124,997.00	\$	865.71	\$	43,285.39
	South Shoreline	\$	310,637.00	\$	498.01	\$	24,900.29
	Subtotal	\$	547,649.00	\$	2,133.71	\$	106,685.69

DRAFT Cost Estimate Summary

25-Nov-02

Site	Feature	Construction	Average Annual O&M	Total O&M
G				
	General Site Preparation	\$ 35,667.00	\$ -	\$ -
	Tier I	\$ 51,331.00	\$ 330.00	\$ 16,500.00
	Tier II	\$ 33,178.00	\$ 330.00	\$ 16,500.00
	Tier III	\$ 34,593.00	\$ 330.00	\$ 16,500.00
	Rock Structure	\$ 52,201.00	\$ 352.28	\$ 17,613.75
	Subtotal	\$ 206,970.00	\$ 1,342.28	\$ 67,113.75
H				
	Rock Structure	\$ 90,588.00	\$ 576.45	\$ 28,822.50
	Riparian Corridor Restoration	\$ 360,602.00	\$ 2,530.00	\$ 126,500.00
	Forested Wetland	\$ 351,238.00	\$ 2,640.00	\$ 132,000.00
	Wetland	\$ 235,498.00	\$ 2,090.00	\$ 104,500.00
	Shoreline Protection	\$ 408,130.00	\$ 192.15	\$ 9,607.50
	Subtotal	\$ 1,446,056.00	\$ 8,028.60	\$ 401,430.00
I				
	Rock Structures	\$ 59,242.00	\$ 160.13	\$ 8,006.25
	Riparian Zone	\$ 225,131.00	\$ 1,210.00	\$ 60,500.00
	Forested Wetland	\$ 56,319.00	\$ 440.00	\$ 22,000.00
	Agricultural Tiles	\$ 169.00	\$ -	\$ -
	Prairie Buffer	\$ 154,831.00	\$ 1,540.00	\$ 77,000.00
	Subtotal	\$ 495,692.00	\$ 3,350.13	\$ 167,506.25
K				
	Riparian Zone	\$ 146,876.00	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 110,000.00
	Non-Forested Wetland	\$ 607,808.00	\$ 2,970.00	\$ 148,500.00
	Subtotal	\$ 754,684.00	\$ 5,170.00	\$ 258,500.00
L				
	South Wetland	\$ 245,487.00	\$ 2,090.00	\$ 104,500.00
	Vegetative Swale	\$ 51,682.00	\$ 440.00	\$ 22,000.00
	North Wetland	\$ 129,204.00	\$ 1,100.00	\$ 55,000.00
	Subtotal	\$ 426,373.00	\$ 3,630.00	\$ 181,500.00

Item	Construction	Average Annual O&M	Total O&M	Combined
Total	\$ 5,931,254.00	\$ 42,555.21	\$ 2,127,760.69	\$ 8,059,014.69
Coralville Total	\$ 3,711,127.00	\$ 19,961.50	\$ 998,075.00	\$ 4,709,202.00
Iowa City Total	\$ 978,812.00	\$ 14,850.00	\$ 742,500.00	\$ 1,721,312.00
University of Iowa Total	\$ 1,241,315.00	\$ 7,743.71	\$ 387,185.69	\$ 1,628,500.69
Coralville				
Total	\$ 3,711,127.00	\$ 19,961.50	\$ 998,075.00	
USACE Portion (65%)	\$ 2,412,232.55			
City Portion (35%)	\$ 1,298,894.45			
Total Recreation	\$ 241,223.26			
USACE Portion (50%)	\$ 120,611.63			
City Portion (50%)	\$ 120,611.63			
Iowa City				
Total	\$ 978,812.00	\$ 14,850.00	\$ 742,500.00	
USACE Portion (65%)	\$ 636,227.80			
City Portion (35%)	\$ 342,584.20			
Total Recreation	\$ 63,622.78			
USACE Portion (50%)	\$ 31,811.39			
City Portion (50%)	\$ 31,811.39			
University of Iowa				
Total	\$ 1,241,315.00	\$ 7,743.71	\$ 387,185.69	
USACE Portion (65%)	\$ 806,854.75			
University Portion (35%)	\$ 434,460.25			
Total Recreation	\$ 80,685.48			
USACE Portion (50%)	\$ 40,342.74			
University Portion (50%)	\$ 40,342.74			

Attachment 2: Seed Mix Comments

from Larry Wilson
25 Nov 02

Charlene.Carmack@mvr02.usace.army.mil, 09:46 AM 10/11/2002 -0500, Iowa R. Clear Cr. Section :

From: Charlene.Carmack@mvr02.usace.army.mil
To: larry-wilson@uiowa.edu
Cc: Camie.A.Knollenberg@mvr02.usace.army.mil, Amy.R.Moore@mvr02.usace.army.mil
Subject: Iowa R. Clear Cr. Section 206 - Site F planting list
Date: Fri, 11 Oct 2002 09:46:44 -0500
X-Security: MIME headers sanitized on mail-hub2
See <http://www.its.uiowa.edu/cs/email/attachrename.html>
for details. \$Revision: 1.135 \$Date: 2002-05-26 21:19:33-07

Larry: I will not be able to attend the meeting next Tuesday, so I am sending you as a read-ahead a proposed planting list for Site F. This list is based on the species lists used for planting at the riverbank reconstruction (the flagged page 02931-2 of the project manual you gave me at our last meeting), with a few recommended additions or adjustments. The species from the riverbank reconstruction manual are listed in regular typeface; my additions and explanations are in boldface. Please let us know if these modifications are acceptable to you. Camie and Amy will be at the meeting, or you can e-mail me if you have questions (I will be out of the office all next week, but back the following week).

Thanks!

Site F Proposed Planting List - Sep 02

East (Greek) side: (Note: A tiered planting scheme with emergents at the lowest elevation above the riprap, and short profile mesic prairie at higher elevations)

Emergents - (rivers edge)

Iris virginica shrevei	Blue flag
Sparganium eurycarpum	Common bur reed
Scirpus fluviatilis	River bulrush
Scirpus pungens (americanus)	Three-square
Carex lacustris	Lake sedge
Carex bebbii ?	Bebb's sedge
Carex comosa ?	Bristly sedge
Lobelia cardinalis 2'4'	Cardinal flower

UPT05'

Note: The last 3 species are suggested for addition to the mix to increase diversity of native vegetation. Cardinal flower can exceed 3 feet in height, but so can river bulrush.

Mesic prairie (short profile)

Amorpha canescens	Lead plant
Andropogon (Schizo.) scoparius	Little bluestem
Echinacea purpurea	Purple cone flower
Petalostemum (Dalea) purpureum	Purple prairie clover
Phlox pilosa fulgida	Phlox

Sporobolus heterolepis	Prairie dropseed
Veronicastrum virginicum	Culver's root
Bouteloua gracilis	Blue grama 8'-24"
Bouteloua curtipendula	Sideoats grama 1-3 (2'-3') 1'-2'
Elymus virginicus	Virginia wild rye (4'-5')

Note: The two grama species suggested above are comparatively short in height as is little bluestem. The Virginia wild rye was added as a cover crop species.

West (Hancher) side: When Corps staff visited this part of Site F earlier this year we noted that a berm several feet in height separated this area from the mowed turfgrass portions of the Hancher grounds; also, the area was dominated by reed canarygrass (a non-native, aggressive, comparatively tall, cool-season grass). I also noted that the wet prairie list from the riverbank reconstruction manual includes prairie cordgrass (a tall native grass). Because there appears to be less need to maintain a low vegetative profile on this side of the river and because of the need to overcome the tenacity of reed canarygrass to ensure planting survival, I have suggested some additions to the wet prairie mix from the riverbank reconstruction project. Since the prairie cordgrass and all my suggested additions are comparatively tall, I do not recommend this mix be used on the eastern side.

Wet prairie (Tall)

Lythrum alatum	Winged loosestrife
Mentha arvensis villosa	Wild mint
Phlox glaberrima interior (maculata)	Marsh phlox
Physostegia virginiana	Obedient plant (False dragonhead)
3'-6' Spartina pectinata	Prairie cord grass 4 6' 3'-6'
5'-6' Andropogon gerardii 5'-6' (5'-8')	Big bluestem TOO TALL
2'-3' Sorghastrum nutans 3'-4' (5'-7')	Indian grass might be too tall
4'-7' Panicum virgatum 2'-5' (3'-6')	Switch grass might be too tall
3'-6' Elymus canadensis (5')	Canada wild rye

Charlene Carmack
Economic and Environmental
Analysis Branch (PM-A)
ext. 5570

LITTLE BLUESTEM
(2'-3') 2'-5' vs 3'-4'

WILDLIFE NURSERIES OSHKOSH WI.
() PRAIRIE NURSERY WESTFIELD WI
☐ ORNAMENTAL GRASSES